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Foreword

This document has been prepared under the Integrated Maritime Policy for the Mediterranean (IMP-MED) project1.

Since 2006, the European Union has been promoting an integrated maritime policy (IMP), with the objective of coherently developing maritime activities while ensuring a high level of protection of the marine environment. The EU is aware that “the semi-enclosed nature of the Mediterranean Sea and the trans-boundary impacts of maritime activities call for increased co-operation with non-EU Mediterranean partners2”, and decided to “provide technical assistance, under the European Neighbourhood Policy and Partnership Instrument, for Mediterranean partners that express an interest in an integrated approach to maritime affairs, thereby raising awareness and assisting in setting objectives and implementation mechanisms” : this is the policy base for the IMP-MED Project, funded by the EU and dedicated to promoting an integrated approach to maritime affairs in the Southern Mediterranean (ENPI) countries and to assisting those countries with implementing such an approach. This project started mid-November 2010 and will last four years.

This manual is designed as a project tool, linked to technical assistance activities provided under the project, and is directed specifically at the technical needs of the nine project Partner Countries – Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestinian Authority and Tunisia. It is not intended to be a static document, but rather – by linking its content to activities and intended outcomes in each Partner Country – will be developed during the course of the project.

This IMP Manual is linked directly to a series of technical “packages” (modules) that have been developed to provide technical assistance and capacity-building work under the project and which are to be used:

- at the national level, as the basis for national workshops on IMP (which are the major project actions at the national level); these workshops will be built around the general technical packages and will form the basis also for more specific modules dedicated to issues of national interest;
- at the regional level, as a basis for general methodological presentations and exchanges of best practice.

This IMP Manual is designed to provide a common link between the various project actions, by outlining the general project approach and the key steps to developing IMP on which other project tools can build.

The “Institutional and Organisational Analysis Manual” also produced under the framework of the IMP-MED project is part of the technical package and is intended to help the national administrations in analyzing the national situation regarding integration of national maritime policies and the legal, organisational and administrative framework and in selecting the issues and modules most relevant for specific technical assistance. This is available on the project web site.

A short IMP Manual is also available on the project web site. This provides an introduction to the themes and issues which are discussed in more detail in this full IMP manual.

---

1 For more information, see www.imp-med.eu.
Executive Summary

Since 2006, the European Union has been developing an integrated maritime policy (IMP). From an economic, social or environmental point of view, the Mediterranean is an intensively used sea, with many stakeholders. The EU supports the development of IMP both at the national scale and regional level including all countries around the Mediterranean.

This manual has been developed under the framework of the IMP-MED Project aimed at contributing to the technical assistance part of the EU support to the ENPI South countries. It aids the development of their own national IMP policy and encourages their contribution to the building of a common approach for the Mediterranean region’s maritime problems and assets.

National maritime policies are key components of supra-national integrated maritime policies. In order to be able to contribute to a regional policy without jeopardizing their specific needs, priorities and assets, each country must first build a holistic and shared maritime vision and develop the specific mechanisms and tools needed to implement it in all national policies, as well as efficiently contributing to the work at regional level.

A national integrated maritime policy must be built on a common vision, shared by all authorities and major stakeholders. The policy should encompass all maritime issues: marine resources, marine environment, use of maritime space, jobs, economy, and provide all the maritime policies with the same basic principles and guidelines for implementing them.

In order to develop and implement this overarching vision in all policies, programs and projects, each country should develop specific governance mechanisms allowing cooperation at all the relevant levels, between all the relevant stakeholders. This can be done only if coordination mechanisms are set up among the public authorities in charge of the definition and the implementation of all policies, particularly mechanisms related to inter-ministerial coordination between ministers, at the decision level, and between administrations and national agencies at the implementation level.

The IMP is built on existing policies: sectoral policies and cross-cutting policies (requiring contribution from several policies). Usually, these policies are developed in an independent way. In order to make them consistent, they should be adapted so their objectives (which must be consistent with potentially conflicting other policies) tools, approaches and mechanisms are consistent. Integration is much easier if all maritime policies are built in a coherent manner, with common approaches, consistent calendars, “cross-sectoral” governance, and all with the aim of trying to develop common or shared legal and operational tools when possible rather than separate independent tools and instruments (e.g. agencies, legal instruments; environmental assessment tools and mechanisms…) Common or coordinated tools support integration, while specific tools are more difficult to combine across sectors.

The most important mechanisms developed here are related to:

- evaluation (coordinated evaluation rather than separate evaluation of each policy), with common agreed procedures and common indicators;

- management of the maritime space and resources (common and shared space and resources cannot be allocated separately or managed in an independent way through separate procedures specific to each policy);

- knowledge: common visions and common decisions should be based only on common knowledge, gathered and managed in a coordinated way and distributed to all decision-makers in order to support sound and informed decisions;

- maritime surveillance and marine monitoring: monitoring and surveillance information is a major key to aid decisions, and should be based on common or shared resources in order to save costs, increase efficiency and provide each decision-maker with a complete view of the context, situation and risks.
## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCOBAMS</td>
<td>Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black and Mediterranean Seas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Exclusive Economic Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMODNET</td>
<td>European Marine Observation and Data Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENPI</td>
<td>European Neighbourhood and Partnership Instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFCM</td>
<td>General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICZM</td>
<td>Integrated Coastal Zone Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO</td>
<td>International Maritime Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Integrated Maritime Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP</td>
<td>Maritime Spatial Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP/MAP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme – Mediterranean Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSPIRE</td>
<td>&quot;Directive establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCO TRANS</td>
<td>(p. 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG MARE</td>
<td>Directorate-General for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIMBY</td>
<td>(common language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>(a trade market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSSD</td>
<td>World Summit on Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Scope and purpose of the manual

This manual has been produced under the framework of the IMP-MED Project ("Integrated Maritime Policy for the Mediterranean"), funded by the EU and aimed at promoting an integrated approach to maritime affairs in the Southern Mediterranean (ENPI) countries.

It is part of the “Technical Assistance” strand of the project. It is intended to be used:

- by the Partner countries of the IMP-MED Project;
- by the Project Team as a support to the “National Workshops” organised in the voluntary countries.

This Manual is specifically focused on the development of integrated maritime policies at the national level, although it is recognised that through the development of national IMPs and through integrated regional cooperation national IMPs may become components of a future regional IMP.

The Manual is therefore mainly directed to National administrations at national level (central administrations), in charge of elaborating, designing and implementing integrated maritime policies or maritime policies in the framework of an integrated maritime policy. It is specifically aimed to help them:

- understanding the rationale for and background to the development of a national integrated maritime policy;
- identifying the main gaps in administrative setups, governance mechanisms and policies design;
- supporting policy-makers in the elaboration of a national roadmap towards a national IMP;
- understanding and addressing national priorities for the development of this roadmap.
2. National Integrated Policies

2.1. What is a National IMP?

An integrated maritime policy is a process that takes account of competing sectors and interests to provide a coherent unified policy and, subject to the ability of vulnerable maritime environments to support them, to accommodate their conflicting needs and objectives. The impacts of socio-economic activity, individual, joint and cumulative, on the coastal environment must be taken into account so that development is sustainable. Sustainable development will support sustainable and healthy seas.

Essentially, an IMP is a mode of policy-making and decision-taking that seeks to overcome the discordance between competing demands on the marine environment from coastal, marine and maritime activities and to protect the environment on which these activities depend.

A national IMP aims to allow states to address all maritime issues through coordinated approaches in order to ensure that all policies and actions support common national objectives related to marine and maritime issues.

An IMP addresses all maritime sectors, but doesn’t replace sectoral maritime policies: it is built on them, adding connections and shared visions and tools. An IMP will establish a process to bring together all sectors and interests in the maritime area, both public and private, so that they can agree in a holistic manner overarching measures that will ensure the sustainability of the marine environment which supports them. Through the institution of procedures to monitor and supervise the maritime area, anticipatory and precautionary measures may be adopted to counter threats to the maintenance of healthy seas.

Although States may devise unilaterally their national policies, owing to the many shared aspects of the maritime zone, greater coherence may be achieved through regional co-operation and agreement.

2.2. Rationale for the Development of a National IMP

2.2.1. Legal impetus

The need for an integrated approach to the management of the oceans and their resources has long been recognised by the international community. For example, the preamble to the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) states that ‘the problems of ocean space are closely inter-related and need to be considered as a whole.’ Many rights and duties in the Convention are inter-related. For example, under the Convention, States are entitled to exploit their natural resources, but must do so in accordance with their environmental policies and their duty to protect and preserve the marine environment.

Nevertheless, UNCLOS did not lead initially to the development of IMP approaches. During the 1990s, however, particularly in the context of environmental protection, an increasing recognition developed of the need to integrate policies. Thus, Agenda 21, adopted at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in 1992, reviewed a range of aspects relating to protection of the marine environment and marine living resources. They observed that marine degradation was caused by a variety of reasons and specified a range of sectoral and cross-cutting actions related to sustainable development.

With the intention of giving effect to Agenda 21, the parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity agreed at their second meeting that an integrated approach to the management of marine and coastal areas was ‘the most suitable framework for addressing human impacts on marine and coastal biological diversity and for promoting conservation and sustainable use of this biodiversity’ (Decision II/10, Point 2) and proceeded to develop a comprehensive integration agenda (e.g. Decision VIII/22 on enhancing the implementation of integrated marine and coastal area management).

Updating this agenda in 2002, the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) Johannesburg Plan of Implementation stated:
Oceans, seas, islands and coastal areas form an integrated and essential component of the Earth's ecosystem and are critical for global food security and for sustaining economic prosperity and the welfare of many national economies, particularly in developing countries. Ensuring the sustainable development of the oceans requires effective coordination and co-operation, including at the global and regional levels, between relevant bodies, and actions at all levels...

And more particularly, it exhorted States to:

promote integrated, multidisciplinary and multi-sectoral coastal and ocean management at the national level and encourage and assist coastal States in developing ocean policies and mechanisms on integrated coastal management.

The idea of integration is not limited to environmental matters, however. Both legal instruments and international mechanisms in various sectors recognise the need to adopt more integrated approaches. This is leading to increased inter-organisational coordination amongst regional and global maritime organisations, often through formalised mechanisms. Some instruments also address specific aspects of IMP. In a Mediterranean context, the most important example is the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of the Mediterranean against Sea Pollution, which came into force in March 2011. The main objective of the Protocol is to facilitate, through the rational planning of activities, the sustainable development of coastal zones by ensuring that the environment and landscapes are taken into account in harmony with economic, social and cultural development. To this end, a range of measures which affect the use of the coastal zone was advanced. These measures are designed to:

- encourage sustainable coastal development, while mitigating the impacts of that development,
- manage the competing uses of coastal space,
- achieve coherence between public and private initiatives and between all decisions by the public authorities, at the national, regional and local levels.

2.2.2. Economic and social rationale

One of the main drivers for the development of maritime policies is the will to develop the use of the maritime space and the exploitation of marine resources, in order to encourage sustainable growth.

Of course, this is not a new concern. But scientific and technologic development during the last decades now virtually open all marine resources and all maritime space (even deep waters) to human activities: it is now possible to build permanent structures at tens or hundreds of kilometres off the coasts, to harness deep mineral resources (oil and gas, metals and materials), to exploit a wide range of biological resources (fish or algae farming, pharmaceutical use of genetic marine resources…) and to access the tremendous renewable energy resources of oceans (wind, waves, currents and heat).

There is also a growing demand for maritime and coastal recreational activities, which can generate important economic activities in the coastal zones and jobs for the local population, but which often compete for the same public resources and the same public space, calling for public regulation.

Thus, there is an important potential for the development of the maritime economy in most of the coastal States. For these States, the maritime space and marine resources not only represent new hopes, but also new challenges. Regulation of the competition for the use and exploitation of these public marine and maritime resources and space, allocation of resources and space and protection against looting can no longer be addressed only in a sectoral and local way, and consistent policies must be developed in order to allow both the development of new economic sectors, and the proper management of resources and protection of the marine environment. By reducing conflicts and
legal uncertainty, the integrated approach can allow robust development of activities, with direct and indirect benefits in terms of economic growth and jobs.

Maritime activities often involve high investments, and face high risks. Developing integrated approaches is a good way to examine, reduce and share risks and generate confidence in long-term investments. This can then provide the long-term vision both the industry and the regulator need.

### 2.2.3. Environmental rationale

Marine resources have long been considered inexhaustible, and people have long considered that the Ocean could regenerate indefinitely. The 20th century demonstrated that this was an illusion: depletion of fish stocks and major accidental and diffuse pollutions showed the need for serious protection and management measures for marine environment and resources. Conventional sectoral management has failed to protect marine resources and environment, calling for more integrated and long-term oriented approaches.

Biological, mineral or energetic, the marine resources are mainly used to complement land resources or replace depleted ones, and cannot be managed independently; on the other hand, most of the threats to the marine environment are linked to terrestrial activities. Marine and terrestrial environment and resources should hence be managed altogether, in a land-sea integrated approach.

The marine environment is very complex and spreads from local to global interdependent ecosystems. These ecosystems support the cumulative impacts of all human activities: these cumulative effects can no longer be addressed in a sectoral way, through simple sectoral measures (the sum of the “moderate effects” allowed by each sectoral regulation can result in a major effect for the environment).

The IMP allows implementation in all policies of the ecosystem-based approach: it provides a strategic, legal and operational framework to efficiently implement this approach at all scales.

### 2.2.4. Governance and cooperation rationale

The maritime zones of each coastal state are not isolated; the Ocean is global, and no border can stop pollution or hold fish; each coastal state also shares many maritime issues with neighbours or states in the same regional basin (e.g. the Mediterranean Sea). Cooperation at the regional or international level is mandatory both for managing common resources or protection of a common marine environment.

Balanced cooperation implies negotiations where each country should be able to advocate its specific interests and assets: this means that every country should be aware of its national maritime assets and priorities.

But cooperation is also necessary at subnational levels: many maritime and coastal issues are addressed through policies and actions conducted at subnational level under the authority of local powers, and coherence in the long-term can be maintained only if all stakeholders and authorities at all levels share a common vision of the national maritime assets and priorities. This requires consistent integrated approaches at each level, and mechanisms to consistently and “vertically” integrate actions at all levels.

A National IMP is the best support for consistent positions in all sectors and fields, at all governance levels from local to national.
2.3. State practice

The impetus that has developed at the international level is now creating a framework for action at the national level. A number of countries, including among several others the European Union, and some of its Member States, Australia, Canada, Norway and the United States, have started to develop new policy frameworks for sustainable use of the oceans which encompass every aspect of maritime affairs, and set specific goals in an inter-sectoral approach.

A short review of some of these developments is provided in Appendices 1 and 2.
3. Towards the Development of a National IMP

3.1. Introduction

There is no standard model for the IMP at national level: each national IMP must be built with a tailored approach, taking into account many parameters: importance of maritime and coastal issues, political and institutional context, existing policies and operational instruments, organisations and governance (administrative setup, industry, public and NGOs), etc.

An IMP is never developed from scratch: in all maritime countries, there are already existing instruments (policies, laws and regulations, administrative setups, bodies and mechanisms…) which can and should be used – with adaptation when needed – in order to progressively build the national IMP.

Nevertheless, some components should be found in any IMP;

- maritime policies, most of them are already existing, but should be adapted to fit the general framework of the IMP;
- specific integration mechanisms, to be set up at the very beginning of the IMP to allow a consistent development and implementation framework for the other elements;
- cross-cutting tools and mechanisms, potentially shared by some or all the maritime policies,

The progressive development of the integrated maritime policy is a long process (a few years minimum), and should be planned in a structured way; in the IMP-MED Project, the national process towards the establishment of the national IMP is called a "national roadmap".

3.2. IMP “policy components”

Schematically, a national integrated maritime policy can be considered a consistent set of policies, implemented in a coordinated manner by public authorities and private stakeholders (organisations), based on common institutions (constitution, laws…). It is based on a common vision shared by all stakeholders, and on common principles and guidelines. Every time cooperation is needed, a consistent set of cooperation rules is used by every stakeholder (governance). Each specific policy (e.g. maritime transport, etc.) is designed in order to maximize sharing of measures and tools with other policies. A common framework is developed to optimize monitoring and surveillance. Finally, all the policy components are assessed and if needed revised using the same evaluation framework.

The following figure proposes an outline of a national IMP. This is by no means an absolute reference for all IMPs, but just a way to introduce the various components of the IMP discussed in this manual, and their relationship.
Building the national IMP implies working a coherent way on all of these “elementary bricks” in order to create or adapt them.

3.2.1. Policies

The basic components of the IMP are “policies”, more specifically policies related to marine and maritime issues\(^3\) which will be called here equally “maritime policies”.

In this document, “policy” refers to a consistent set of objectives related to general interest together with principles and guidelines, decision mechanisms, dispositions taken in order to reach this objectives (legal instruments, operational instruments, organisational setups, enforcement and other measures…) and evaluation and revision mechanisms.

A national IMP virtually encompasses all types of policies at all levels from local to national. In order to better take into account the specific questions related to integration, it is useful to refer to the following typology (this specific typology has only operational objectives related to IMP, and is by no means a general typology of policies).

Most of the existing maritime policies are dedicated to the regulation of specific maritime activities; they are usually dedicated to specific economic sectors (e.g. maritime transport, fisheries, oil and gas exploitation, tourism…). These sectoral policies can be exclusively maritime ones (i.e. deal only with marine or maritime issues and maritime zones and spaces), but very often sectoral policies extend on both land and sea (transport, energy…) and maritime sectoral policies are usually maritime components of more general policies.

Many policies are “cross-cutting policies”, in the sense that their objectives can be reached not only through measures specific to one sector, but through measures falling within or concerning several policies. Research and innovation policy, environment policy, natural resources policy, foreign relations policy… are examples of such cross-cutting policies. Nearly all cross-cutting policies potentially extend to the maritime zones and concern all the maritime issues.

Finally, some policies are designed at specific governance levels (e.g.: local government) linked to specific territories or spaces, or at specific scales (ecosystem, physical region, watershed): in these areas or at these levels, additional or specific objectives apply beyond the general objectives assigned to national policies.

\(^3\) In this document, “marine” refers to natural ocean (e.g. marine currents, marine biodiversity), “maritime” to human activities related to the ocean and their consequences (e.g. maritime transport, maritime pollution).
(sectoral or cross-cutting). In this document, the consistent implementation at a given scale of all general policies will be called “spatially-based policies” or “regional policies”. The relevant scales can extent from regional (in the international law sense; e.g. Mediterranean, Baltic Sea...) to subnational (e.g.: coastal zones) or local (e.g. bay). Spatially-based policies generally address several sectoral or cross-cutting issues; the objectives set by such policies virtually constrain all sectoral and cross-cutting policies when they produce some effects in the considered area.

**3.2.2. Governance mechanisms**

Consistent policies are based on consistent decisions.

Consistency is easily achieved and decisions easily made when only one organisation is in charge of defining and implementing the policy, and when all the needed information is produced by this organisation.

As far as the IMP is concerned, this is never the case:

- at the public authorities level, several (many) organisations contribute to the definition and implementation of this policy, including all state branches (legislative, executive, judiciary), agencies and other public bodies, and often public authorities at subnational levels;
- several categories of stakeholders have direct or indirect legitimate interest (economic or not) in this policy or produce information relevant for the IMP.

Therefore, the elaboration and the implementation of a national IMP require a *high level of cooperation* between the concerned organisations and stakeholders.

In order to allow such cooperation over the long term, specific governance mechanisms must be developed at the earliest stage of the development of the IMP, at all the relevant levels.

Regarding the development of a national IMP, governance mechanisms at national level are essential, and particularly:

- governance mechanisms at the inter-ministerial level: the national executive branch is legitimately in charge of steering the development and the implementation of the national IMP; such a policy requires consistent decisions and implementation measures by several (often more than ten) departments structurally established to work in a sectoral way, and specific governance mechanisms should be set up to allow collective decisions and long term cooperation for implementing them;
- participation of maritime stakeholders at national level: the IMP must take into account all assets and all interests related to the maritime activities and the marine environment. This requires extensive discussions with the participation of all stakeholders before arbitrations and decisions by the legitimate public authorities; the cooperation and the participation of these stakeholders must be organized at the national level.

Depending on national situations, other “vertical” governance mechanisms should be developed. For instance, in countries where some competences have been devolved to local powers (e.g. regions of federated states), or where there is a need to manage different maritime zones with specific rules or principles (e.g. based on ecosystem or management reasons), the implementation of the national policy can be partly devolved to sub-national levels: this includes in some cases the elaboration of local laws, and in all cases the definition of the practical ways national principles and laws are going to be applied in the concerned zones. IMP should envisage processes in order to ensure that the national maritime policy is coherently and effectively applied at these levels.

**3.2.3. Integration mechanisms**

A national maritime policy cannot exist if each maritime policy has independently defined inconsistent objectives. A major issue for integration is therefore defining relevant mechanisms to ensure consistency of all the policies objectives.

Among the main mechanisms which can be used to progress towards integration, two of them are essential: *vision,* and *evaluation.*
Vision: this is a set of long-term goals assigned to policies. All maritime policies encompassed by the IMP should share a common vision, which should be integrated into the set of specific goals for each policy. Such goals can be related to results (quantitative or qualitative; e.g. number of jobs, production, impacts…) or to processes ("which way are these results to be reached?"), such as guidelines. The vision underlying each maritime policy should be consistent with the overarching vision set up in the framework of the IMP.

Evaluation: Evaluation is the comparison of actual outcomes against initial objectives. Each maritime policy should define specific evaluation mechanisms at all stages of implementation (before, during, at the end) in order to allow periodic revision of the objectives and implementation measures. But the specific evaluation mechanisms cannot be independent for each maritime policy: they should be consistent in order to allow evaluation of the overarching IMP.

Of course, such common integration mechanisms cannot exist if the relevant governance mechanisms have not been defined and agreed by all stakeholders.

3.2.4. Cross-cutting mechanisms and tools

At the implementation level of each maritime policy, specific mechanisms and tools should be developed in order to prevent divergence of separate policies, to share common information and to optimize the organisational and operational setups.

A wide range of mechanisms can help developing and implementing an IMP, such as:

- **funding mechanisms**: rather than allocating independent funding to each maritime policy, it is often possible to integrate some of the implementation measures and instruments, for example to fund common programs or structures (e.g. agencies); economies of scale, avoiding duplication and reaching critical mass for long term ambitious programs ((e.g. mapping of EEZ) can be mentioned among the expected benefits of such an integration of funding;

- **knowledge production and sharing**: common decisions can be taken only based on common and shared knowledge; integrating knowledge production related to different maritime policies (including marine and maritime research) can help making information consistent, filling the gaps in data, and disseminating information among all concerned stakeholders.

Some tools are of particular importance in the framework of the IMP:

- **monitoring and surveillance**: whatever sector they are related to, all maritime activities use and impact the same maritime areas; common mechanisms should be developed for assessing the environmental impacts (monitoring of marine environment) and supervising maritime activities at sea; such common mechanisms can significantly reduce the global cost of monitoring and surveillance by pooling expensive means (ships, planes, satellite, radar stations…) and improve the overall efficiency compared to separate and often duplicate systems and networks;

- **maritime spatial planning**: as maritime space must be shared between more and more activities, some of which are now permanent, common mechanisms must be developed for allocating space and regulating maritime space uses in order to reduce conflicts, manage cumulative environmental impacts and optimize the occupation of space, particularly in the maritime part of the coastal zones.

3.2.5. International cooperation

A successful IMP cannot exist only at the national level. Marine ecosystems and resources transcend national boundaries, many maritime activities take place on an international scale (trade, transport, cruises, etc.) and many maritime problems can only be solved through effective international cooperation (e.g. marine pollution, overfishing, climate change). Many of the most urgent challenges that require an integrated approach cannot be addressed without effective international cooperation.

Effective international cooperation in IMP comprises the negotiation of agreements to address new issues and participation in those agreements, organisations and processes already established (the "external" dimension) and also the effective implementation of international agreements at the national level and effective national coordination with international organisations (the “internal” dimension). Depending on a variety of factors, such cooperation may be aimed at the global, regional, subregional or bilateral level and
may take a number of forms (binding conventions, MOUs, codes, action plans, etc. and organisations—legally constituted, informal processes, technical networks, etc.).

Integration at national level has an important role to play, since it can assist in identifying the issues which need to be addressed (and the levels at which cooperation should take place), can help ensure that positions taken at the international level are consistent both with national policies and expectations and with other international positions taken by the country and can help ensure that the implementation of international commitments is carried out in an efficient, coordinated and effective manner.

3.3. National roadmap towards IMP

In order to develop an IMP, most of these “policy components” must be either adapted when they already exist (e.g. sectoral policies), or created when needed (e.g. maritime governance framework, cross-cutting tools...).

The development of a national IMP is therefore heavily dependent on the country institutional and organisational situation, and on the existing operational setups.

In the next section of this manual, specific focus will be made on the major policy components. But a graduated approach should be defined in each country to develop in the right order the relevant components: some of them are compulsory (for instance, inter-ministerial and interdepartmental governance at national level), some can be developed or improved later (e.g. some operational cross-cutting tools or implementation bodies).

In the IMP-MED Project, the national approach to progressively develop the required components is called “National Roadmap”.

A national roadmap should identify the most important IMP components to be developed (taking into account the specific situation in the country, and the maritime priorities (sectors, zones, etc.), designate the organisations (i.e. ministries and governance structures) in charge of steering the work for each component, and the provisional timetable.

![Figure 4: National Roadmap](image-url)
4. Developing National Integrated Maritime Policies

4.1. Why is a “vision” needed?

A common vision, shared by all major stakeholders, at the national level is a pre-requisite to the development of a national integrated maritime policy. There are several reasons why the development of a national vision and the elaboration of explicit objectives are essential:

- It is indispensable support to the political decision to develop such a policy.
- A shared vision entails a process which promotes understanding of the importance of a country’s maritime assets, highlights national issues related to the sea and brings together all government administrations and all major stakeholders into a common process.
- It builds a common understanding on the priorities for national maritime policy and on the objectives of integrating maritime governance and policies.

Consistent policies can be based only on consistent visions.

The vision underlies all maritime policies and strategies (private and public). It basically expresses a political will: it defines what the country does and does not want, and which way these objectives should be pursued in the long-term. This reference should be common to all national concerned stakeholders, be they public or private.

All the countries which have started to build new policy frameworks with an integrated approach have in some way developed such a national reference framework.

Often the general vision can be very widely stated. For example, in Australia⁴ the overall vision is described as establishing a framework to “promote ecologically-sustainable development” of ocean resources and “the encouragement of internationally competitive marine industries, while ensuring the protection of marine biological diversity”, while in the United States⁵ the objective is stated achieving “an America whose stewardship ensures that the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes are healthy and resilient, safe and productive, and understood and treasured so as to promote the well-being, prosperity, and security of present and future generations.”

4.2. What is a vision?

In practice, a vision is a more detailed statement of objectives, priorities, principles and guidelines. Although there is no single model of an integrated vision for maritime policy, a comprehensive vision might typically contain the following elements:

General objectives and priorities: This part represents the political element and defines a country’s main expectations and priorities related to the sea, particularly (but not only) the maritime zones under national sovereignty or jurisdiction. Objectives might indicate an intention to extend maritime jurisdiction (e.g. by claiming an EEZ), to maximize the potential from sustainable fisheries, or that resources – such as offshore oil and gas reserves – are strategic and should be exploited only when other sources are no longer available, or that national marine resources should be exploited by nationals, etc.

---

⁵ http://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/ceq/initiatives/oceans
Common principles and guidelines: This part of the vision is essential to support integration. It comprises common principles and consistent guidelines to be implemented in each sectoral or thematic strategy to ensure that there are common rules when needed (maritime governance, resources and space sharing, conflicts arbitration, etc.). Examples might include common principles and guidelines determining management rules for allocation and use of maritime space or rules on access to resources.

Sectoral and thematic guidelines: When there is a specific need for sectoral objectives (for example, in those fields considered as maritime priorities for that country), they should be included in the vision. This ensures that they will be taken into account not only in the specific sectoral strategies and policies, but also (consistently) in other sectoral strategies and policies. For example, if the national vision includes reserving maritime space for some activities (e.g. fisheries, offshore wind farms, marine protected areas, etc.), including spatial planning prescriptions in the vision helps to ensure that all further sectoral and space-based strategies and policies will take them into account, preventing future conflicts.

The vision gives only a general view of the expected results: it must then be implemented in strategies (a detailed list of objectives and sets of indicators to assess them), then in policies (public strategies complemented with a set of institutional - e.g. laws - and operational - e.g. agencies, funding, etc. - prescriptions consistent with the guidelines and adapted to the expected outcomes) and regulations (provide the means for achieving the expected outcome).

An integrated vision cannot be built just by adding independent sectoral ones: it must take into account and be tested against all interrelations, be they related to maritime space, marine resources, cumulative impacts, conflicts or synergies.

### 4.3. Which fields and sectors are concerned?

An integrated national vision should ideally cover all maritime assets directly or indirectly related to maritime issues, all maritime sectors dealing directly with maritime activities and all cross-cutting fields directly or indirectly related to the maritime sectors.

Maritime assets include:

- All maritime areas under national jurisdiction, and areas beyond when appropriate

- All marine resources (biological, mineral, energy), including those not only of commercial value, but also social, environmental, cultural, etc.

- All maritime activities, be they conducted in the national jurisdiction zones or by nationals beyond national jurisdiction

- Terrestrial activities which are likely to have significant direct or indirect consequences on marine or maritime assets

The vision should address all the maritime issues considered important for the country. The box below gives an indicative list of the fields it should encompass.
Box 1: Maritime sectors and cross-cutting fields

**Sectoral fields** include:

- Maritime transport, including ports
- Offshore oil and gas exploitation, including underwater transport of O&G (pipelines...)
- Marine materials (aggregates, sand, gravel...) and maritime mining
- Maritime fisheries, including harbours
- Aquaculture and mariculture
- Shipbuilding and other maritime industry
- Leisure yachting, sport, including harbours
- Tourism and cruises
- Marine energy (all forms: wind, waves, thermal...), including underwater energy transport (cables)
- Telecommunications, including submarine cables
- Other maritime activities (desalination, exploitation of underwater sources...etc.)

**Cross-cutting fields** include:

- Environment: water quality, biodiversity, climate...
- Management of natural resources: living resources, mineral resources, energy resources
- Defence and security
- International relations
- Country planning (coastal areas)
- Research and innovation
- Culture (including underwater heritage)

Finally, the vision should address the issue of the use of *maritime space* in all three (or four) dimensions (sharing, exclusive or no-exclusive allocation of space to some activities, management...)

When relevant, the guidelines should address those terrestrial land activities which are likely to have significant direct or indirect consequences on marine or maritime assets

### 4.4. Creating and Implementing a national vision for IMP

The creation of a national vision for IMP entails a comprehensive and inclusive process, to be conducted amongst all concerned administrations and in partnership with the major stakeholders. It is an iterative process (the national vision should be periodically reviewed and adapted, based on a proper evaluation process) and can be developed as knowledge, capacity and ambitions develop. The national vision must be developed keeping in mind that it should be consistent with existing and future visions at higher level, regional (e.g. Mediterranean) or global.

There is no single approach about what a national vision should contain, nor a common recommended methodology as to how one should be developed.

Above, it was noted that common elements included:

- General objectives and priorities, as the main political statement of a country’s intentions and goals for the maritime sector.
- Common principles and guidelines, to ensure consistency and common aims in each sectoral or thematic strategy.
- Sectoral and thematic guidelines where needed, to ensure sectoral objectives are consistent with the general objectives and priorities and the common principles and guidelines.

Regarding the development of a national vision, however, two principal aspects should be common to all approaches: assessment (e.g. of current assets, future needs, desired goals, etc.) and consultation,
involving all major maritime stakeholders (national and sub-national administrations and agencies, NGOs, industry, civil society groups, etc.). The processes of assessment should ideally cover all maritime assets and extend to all maritime sectors and relevant cross-cutting sectors (see Box 1: Maritime sectors and cross cutting fields). The first elaboration of a national vision can be developed, however, without extensive study of all assets and without a complete prospective assessment.

Based on these principles, this Manual adopts six stages that are recommended as essential steps to the creation of a national vision:

**Stage [1]** Sectoral prospective. For each sector (both maritime-specific and cross-cutting) assessments should be made in order to identify maritime assets and activities, potentials, risks and opportunities and to elaborate desired goals. While these assessments should take account of current activities and assets, they should mainly be **prospective** (What do we want to achieve? Where do we want policy to go? Etc.).

**Stage [2]** Integrated prospective. The sectoral “prospectives” should be consolidated into a single “integrated” prospective, taking into account all possible interrelations, competition and synergies.

**Stage [3]** Sectoral consultation. The result of this integrated work should be shared with all sectoral stakeholders (public and private, industry, citizens, experts…) in order to raise awareness and produce proposals.

**Stage [4]** Draft vision. At this stage, it should be possible to elaborate a comprehensive **draft vision**, which should take into account the needs of the maritime stakeholders, and reflect principles of integration.

**Stage [5]** Consultations – external and national. The draft vision should be submitted to a **national consultation** (including not only the maritime stakeholders, but the whole country at all scales from national to local) and to an **external consultation** (international organisations, neighbour countries, etc.).

**Stage [6]** Adoption. After a process to review and incorporate the results of these consultations, a **final vision** can be produced and **adopted** in accordance with any applicable administrative processes (and, if appropriate, supported by a relevant instrument – see below). The vision document(s) should be disseminated amongst the stakeholders and should be launched with a public relations exercise.

The vision underlying the integrated maritime policy should be supported by a relevant instrument, which can be **legally binding** (the objectives and orientations are included in the law) or **non-legally binding instrument** (often used to prepare or modify the relevant sectoral or cross-cutting laws), or could be a combination of both.

---

6 It cannot be assumed at the start of the process that all of these stakeholders, assets or even sectors will be involved in maritime policy or known to existing maritime policy actors. Therefore steps may need to be taken before commencing any process to identify and together all national administrative actors concerned; to identify the major stakeholders; and to identify the national maritime assets and issues that currently fall outside maritime-related policies.
Mechanisms should be provided to ensure that the vision is implemented through all sectoral or cross-cutting policies, and that it is taken into account by all national stakeholders in their own strategies. Evaluation and revision mechanisms should also be implemented.
5. Building a National Governance Framework for the IMP

A fully integrated approach encompasses all actions related to maritime policies: development of the vision, development of the policy components, of the laws and regulations, implementation of effective measures and enforcement, including all private actions contributing to the implementation of the policies, and all actions supporting constraints related to the policies. At all these stages, mechanisms should allow participation of all the potentially concerned public and private stakeholders, through a transparent and open process. In such an approach, the following organisations or individuals should all be associated with the governance structure and in some manner allowed to participate in the governance process:

- Public authorities (national, sub-national)
- Industry (all stakeholders from national trade associations to individuals workers)
- All legitimate representation of citizens (NGOs, associations...)
- Experts, e.g. in their role as advisors
- Individual stakeholders

5.1. Maritime Governance

In the framework of the integrated maritime policy, governance is related to the way policy decisions are taken and implemented, involving not only the public authority vested with the responsibility of the decision, but also all other “stakeholders” considered legitimate. In the decision process, governance is not about “which decision?” nor “which way is the decision to be implemented?” (e.g. law; charters, good practices, specific funding instruments...), but about “Which way is the decision taken?” and “How are the relevant stakeholders involved in the decision-making process?”

In the context of an integrated policy which involves all stakeholders at all levels, the framework of governance questions is very wide, encompassing among other issues:

- cooperation between the various bodies in charge of adopting or implementing maritime policies (e.g. different state branches: Government, Parliament...)
- cooperation between administrative bodies and agencies when preparing or implementing decisions related to maritime policies (“administrative governance”)
- cooperation between various representations of the so-called “civil society” in order to shape common visions and positions...

Governance questions also encompass information and consultation processes and the way opinions and contributions are (or are not) taken into account.

5.1.1. Why do we need “maritime governance” for maritime policies?

Governance is an important issue for maritime policies. The ocean and the marine resources and space are common and public resources, and hence not only those who harness the marine resources or occupy the maritime space, but all citizens or group of citizens are legitimately entitled to express their views on the way maritime space and marine resources are managed and allocated. In the context of sustainable development, there is also a general evolution of the governance framework towards more open decision-making processes.

Good governance processes allow greater coherence to be achieved between different policy areas and approaches, producing sound policies and implementing them an efficient way: organisations associated to
decisions are more prone to respect rules when they have been involved, and industry standards and practices can then become real supports to the implementation of widely agreed regulations.

Furthermore, enforcement of laws and regulations at sea is difficult and expensive, and a priori acceptance by stakeholders is a good way to limit costs and get better implementation.

All the IMPs developed in the world consider that involving the maritime stakeholders is an important issue and have defined consistent governance frameworks at the various levels involved in elaboration and implementation of the national maritime policy: federal states, regions, communities.

This manual deals only with governance at national level, but the principles described here should be implemented mutatis mutandis at all subnational levels.

5.1.2. Decision processes

As far as policies are concerned, governance is not related to collective decisions: governments’ and administrations’ policies are underpinned by laws of decision powers, and whatever the decision process, the final decision is the public authorities’ responsibility.

However, there is a wide range of decision making processes, from authoritarian decisions taken without any consultation, expert advice or external intervention, to more sophisticated approaches where relevant legitimate stakeholders’ representatives are consulted at various stages of the decision process and associated to the follow-ups: implementation, evaluation and revisions.

Policy making is a long process, and cannot be reduced to the decision by itself (be it a “hard” decision: law, decree, decision, or a “soft” decision: guidelines, standards…). Very often the decision is part of a complex “closed loop” process starting from discussions, in order to prepare decisions, which are then implemented, monitored, evaluated, and periodically revised to take into account external constraints or changes.

A “generic” decision process can be represented by Figure 7.

Maritime governance deals with the participation of the relevant stakeholders in these various stages.

5.1.3. Main governance issues at national level

This section cannot deal with the general issue of governance in the framework of public policies: it will mainly focus on the specific governance issues related to maritime policies, and more specifically on:

- governance at the executive level: coordination of decisions and of implementation of policies by the Government and the national administrations;
- participation of maritime stakeholders to the elaboration and the implementation of maritime policies.

5.2. Governance at the executive level

National policies are usually prepared and implemented by the national executive branch:

- Ministers, usually in charge of decisions concerning sectoral policies,
  - Several ministers are usually concerned by marine and maritime issues and policies: transport, fisheries, defense, environment, finances, home affairs, foreign affairs…

- National administrations, agencies and other public bodies, in charge of preparing decisions (studies, laws and decrees), implementing them and evaluating the policy outcomes.
The national administrations can have representation at subregional level; agencies can act at various stages: studies, research, operational tasks…

These public stakeholders are directly involved at all stages of the elaboration and implementation of policies.

When it comes to integrating maritime policies, coordination of the work at this level is a major issue: most of ministers and administrations still usually work in a very sectoral way, without taking fully account of the consequences of their decisions and actions for other sectors.

Cooperation at this level should be organized on at least at two levels.

- **Inter-ministerial decisions**, in order to ensure that at ministerial level consistent decisions are taken, touching all the objectives defined by the national maritime policy
  - Usually a dedicated inter-ministerial structure, such as an Ocean Policy Committee, is created, comprising all the ministers in charge of maritime policies or of policies related to maritime and marine issues
  - To ensure that arbitration decisions are really binding for all ministers, this committee should ideally be chaired by the leader of the executive (President, Prime minister or deputy Prime minister, depending on national institutions) rather than by one of the ministers
  - As such a committee can be convened only a few times each year, this structure should be supported by a permanent secretariat, in charge of preparing the decisions and monitoring their implementation.

- **Inter-ministerial coordination**, in order that consistency is maintained all along the implementation processes (drafting bills, funding issues, evaluation…); if there is a permanent secretariat at ministerial level, it should be in charge of conducting the coordination at this level to ensure consistency of actions with decisions taken at the inter-ministerial level.

If needed, a third national coordination level can be defined for **Interagency coordination** (useful mechanisms when national agencies are in charge of the implementation of maritime policy related actions).

The figure presents an example of possible setup for “three-level” inter-ministerial and interagency coordination mechanisms :

- **Government level** (ministers), coordinated decisions are taken within an Inter-ministerial Committee, supported by a permanent secretariat;

- **Administration level**, decisions are implemented in a coordinated way under the control of the permanent secretariat, in charge of ensuring the consistence of the implementation measures with the decisions;

- **Operational level**, agencies cooperate in order to apply the policy measures.

This general scheme could be completed with specialized sectoral (e.g. transport, fisheries…), thematic (e.g. environment) and cross-cutting (e.g. monitoring and surveillance) commissions.
Interministerial coordination is a key issue for any integrated maritime policy. It is usually done by creating internal coordinating structures for maritime affairs within the government framework. This coordination should be organized at the very beginning of the elaboration process in order to direct the elaboration and development of the IMP.

Many solutions can be imagined to provide coordination at this level; a specific solution should be chosen by each country, according to the national institutional and organisational context. In some countries, the priority is to create inter-ministerial structures in order to coordinate the implementation of decisions at the administration level; other countries choose to give priority to the coordination of decisions, and create an inter-ministerial committee at the ministerial level.

Some examples from EU Member States can be found in:

- “Background Paper No 11 on National Approaches to Maritime Affairs”\(^7\) – DG MARE, and
- in a presentation\(^8\) given to the Mediterranean Working Group on IMP in 2010.

General guidelines and examples from non-EU States can also be found in:


Governance issues are important even when a comprehensive legal framework has been developed, encompassing most of the sectoral and cross-cutting issues (see above references in the EU: UK, Sweden), but it is absolutely essential during the transition period before all legislations have been fully integrated, in order to promote such a legal integration.

5.3. Involving the stakeholders in maritime policy decision-making processes

5.3.1. Stakeholders in maritime policies

“Stakeholders”, or “maritime stakeholders”, is a general term used here for all organisations (public or private) and individuals having direct or indirect legitimate interest in maritime policies and their effects and consequences. As far as policies are concerned, public stakeholders are legitimate leaders in the process of elaboration and are given the decision role, but the relevant private stakeholders should be permitted to participate at all stages (through organisations and stakeholders groups).

5.3.1.1. Which are the maritime stakeholders?

In the framework of governance for maritime policies, the main stakeholders are decision makers (public: national or local governments; or private: industry); some are experts (they may give advice to decision makers and provide information to other stakeholders); some are neither decision makers nor experts (“the public”, “Non-State Actors”\(^{10}\)) and they can advocate private or public interests.

Stakeholders can be institutional (i.e. organisations created by institutions such as laws or decrees) or not (collective creation by private persons). Stakeholders can advocate public interests (e.g. environment) or private interests (industry, collective economic or non-economic interests), and at different levels (from local to international).

Decision makers interested by decisions at national level

Beyond the stakeholders at executive level (see above), the main public decision makers concerned by maritime policies are legislative bodies (parliament…), national administrations (ministries, national administrations), other institutional bodies, and local powers (communities, departments, regions, lander, autonomias, wilayas…). All of them are institutionally vested of all public decisions, and their decisions apply to everybody. International bodies (e.g. regional conventions commissions, etc.) should be invited when relevant in order to allow vertical integration with upper levels.

Private decision makers are usually sectoral organisations (industry: transport, fisheries, oil and gas, etc.) ; they can make decisions for their own sector and mainly act as lobbies to influence decisions (public or private) in their sector or in competing sectors;

Other interested stakeholders

Public authorities beyond their competence field can legitimately express views on projects and policies (e.g. local powers for national policies). Some public institutional bodies such as public agencies and operational bodies, or other institutional organisations, international organisations: commissions created by international agreements such as UNEP/MAP, CBD or ACCOBAMS commissions and bodies …

Other organisations can have direct interest in maritime issues: non institutional public stakeholders organisations such as private profit or non-profit organisations advocating collective private interests (economic or not: recreational users) or general interests (NGOs). Experts (universities, consultancy organisations, etc.) play an important role, for they provide information useful for decision makers and institutional experts or the public.

Some of the stakeholders (usually economic operators and research organisations) can form “maritime clusters” in order to develop sectoral and inter-sectoral cooperation and to better advocate their interests\(^{11}\).

The landscape of maritime stakeholders is very complex, and a specific and thorough analysis is needed before any attempt to identify those which should legitimately be included in the national maritime governance scheme.


\(^{11}\) See EC working document : « Maritime clusters »,
5.3.2. Participation of stakeholders

The stakeholders can contribute and participate to maritime policies at various stages:

- **elaboration of the policy**: all the collective or individual inputs and contributions can be collected through institutional consultation of institutional structures, or through ad hoc procedures (working groups, web consultation, etc.);
- **finalization of policy elements** (strategies, bills and laws, decrees...) before adoption; formal consultation of some specific stakeholders can be institutional (e.g. legally imposed); general consultation of all stakeholders, either individually or collectively, can be imposed by law in some cases (e.g. environmental incidences);
- **implementation of the policy**: private decision makers can be associated to this implementation, other stakeholders should for example be able to access monitoring information;
- **evaluation** of the policy, at all stages (ex ante, in itinere, ex post)
- and of course **revision**, when the policy is periodically reviewed before starting another “cycle” (elaboration, preparation, consultation, decision, implementation…).

These various consultation processes can be involved through various consultation processes, from participation to workshops or working groups (for instance, at the elaboration stage) to participation to local or project steering committees or public consultation (internet consultation on draft bills or decrees, etc.).

5.3.3. Involvement of stakeholders at national level

Very often, stakeholders’ consultation is conducted at the planning stage, or at the project stage; less frequently, this is done at policy level, usually on a sectoral basis.

Beyond sectoral or local consultation and consultation at the implementation level, there is a need for a national cross-sectoral forum where all stakeholders can express their views, propose changes and get relevant information to understand the maritime assets and be able to support the development of an ambitious national policy.

This can be done by establishing at the national level a consultative body (such as a national stakeholders’ council), associated and consulted at all the main stages of the development of the IMP where the major maritime stakeholders are represented. Such a structure cannot be permanent; it must be supported by a permanent secretariat and by specific commissions in charge of studies and of the preparation of the Council opinions and advice.
6. Improving Maritime Policies

6.1. Introduction to maritime policies

An integrated maritime policy is first and foremost the integration of separate, often existing, maritime policies.

Policies can be implemented by many ways, but given that policies define regulations which are applicable to everybody, legislation is often the major instrument used to implement policies.

Policies are the normal way of coordinating collective actions (either public actions or public and private actions) towards common general interest objectives. An ideally “complete” policy should comprise:

- Governance dispositions, defining or identifying organisations and their role in the implementation of the policy, and the way they cooperate together,
- A set of objectives covering the whole field of the policy, guidelines to reach these objectives (including the corresponding schedule and milestones) and relevant indicators,
- Institutional arrangements to be respected by all organisations (law, regulations…).

6.2. Which maritime policies are concerned by integration?

An IMP encompasses all the policies which are directly or indirectly related to marine and maritime issues, these will be called “maritime policies” here.

First of all, most of the existing maritime policies are dedicated to the regulation of specific maritime activities; they are usually dedicated to specific economic sectors (e.g. maritime transport, fisheries, oil and gas exploitation, tourism…). These sectoral policies can be exclusively maritime ones (i.e. deal only with marine or maritime issues and maritime zones and spaces), but very often sectoral policies extend on both land and sea (transport, energy…) and maritime sectoral policies are usually maritime components or one part of more general policies.

Many policies are “cross-cutting policies”: their objectives can be reached not only through measures specific to one sector, but through measures falling within or concerning several policies. Research and innovation, the environment, natural resources, and foreign relations etc. are examples of such cross-cutting polices. Nearly all cross-cutting polices potentially extend to the maritime zones and concern all the maritime issues.

At last, some policies are designed at specific governance levels (e.g.: local government) linked to specific territories or spaces, or at specific scales (ecosystem, physical region, catchment): in these areas or at these levels, additional or specific objectives assigned to national policies (sectoral or cross-cutting). In this document, the consistent implementation at a given scale of all general policies will be called “spatially-based policies” or “regional policies”. The relevant scales can extent from regional (in the international law sense; e.g. Mediterranean, Baltic Sea…) to subnational (e.g.: marine part of coastal zones) or local (e.g. bay).

Figure 10: Sectoral and cross-cutting policies
Spatially-based policies generally address several sectoral or cross-cutting issues; the objectives set by such policies are designed to constrain all sectoral and cross-cutting policies which affect the considered area.

6.3. Policy design

Any policy should:

- develop a long term vision of the expected outcomes, based on prospective studies;
- define realistic strategic objectives, schedules and milestones to implement this vision;
- set up principles and guidelines;
- implement specific measures to reach the objectives, based on these principles and guidelines (including regulation and enforcement measures, funding, operational setups…);
- implement monitoring and surveillance arrangements to allow collection of information related to the implementation and outcomes of these measures;
- set up evaluation and revision processes in order to assess progress towards the expected objectives.

This is usually done through a wide range of instruments at various levels, some binding, some not:

- legal instruments
- standards
- good practices
- specific agreements such as charters
- studies
- operational arrangements (agencies, observatories, etc.)
- funding instruments (taxes, fees, funds…).

6.4. How to improve maritime policies towards better integration?

When maritime policies are developed with only one sectoral vision or with stakeholders from just one sector, they are very often incomplete and tend to focus on that one sector. This can lead to bias in the policy, to the detriment to other sectors.

The underlying principles of policies and regulations are also very often specific or not defined: allocation of maritime space or maritime resources, regulation and arbitration rules are rarely clearly expressed, and usually do not take into account the need for consistency with the principles underlying other policies addressing the same maritime space or the same marine resources.

Among the most important factors for proper integration are:
6.4. General design of policies

Each concerned policy should be assessed with regard to maritime integration.

This is generally easy for the maritime sectoral policies (e.g. fisheries); less easy for some policies addressing both land and sea issues (e.g. transport, energy) or mainly land issues (e.g. water management).

6.4.1. Sectoral policies

The main gap in sectoral policy design is usually that the objectives and principles are mainly implied rather than clearly defined.

This can lead to the underlying principles being poorly defined, which is one of the major causes of conflicts: the way rights to exploit marine resources are allocated, the way the rights to use/occupy maritime space are allocated.

Another significant obstacle to the integration of sectoral maritime policies is that they tend to develop specific instruments and specific implementation and regulation measures, rather than trying to use common instruments and shared mechanisms: this often leads to different regulation bodies operating in the same space or managing the same resources with different rules, at the cost of duplication of means and even of conflicts.

6.4.1.2. Cross-cutting policies

Cross-cutting policies are generally not exclusively marine or maritime policies: usually, only some parts of these policies specifically address maritime or marine policies.

Beyond the general design, particular attention should be paid to the following questions:

- is there a clearly defined “maritime strand” in the policy? If not, is it possible to identify specific maritime issues to be specifically addressed in a consistent way?
- are maritime issues taken into account in all other policy strands, with explicit objectives?
Here are some examples of cross-cutting policies where the maritime assets should be taken into account at the policy design stage:

- **Research and innovation**: marine and maritime research is a relatively new issue for research policies, associated to some very specific themes (e.g. deep marine ecosystems, marine energy…) which are very demanding (research ships, centres, satellite programs…); very often, marine and maritime issues are not specifically addressed in national research and innovation policies;

- **Environment**: the national environment policy should define specific objectives (e.g. biodiversity conservation) for the marine environment in all maritime zones under the country’s sovereignty or jurisdiction, but also beyond; the evaluation of the incidences of activities should address both the effects of marine activities and land-based activities.

Several other important cross-cutting policies should be assessed in order to ensure that the marine and maritime assets and issues are considered at the right level: defense and security, foreign affairs, natural resources, country planning (for coastal zones), etc.

### 6.4.2. Governance

The governance scheme in policies needs to be explicit: the role of actors (leading actors such as public authorities, also of the public or private actors) in charge of the implementation or contributing to this implementation should be explicitly defined and accepted by all of them, and of course be consistent with the general governance framework defined at the IMP level.

The governance mechanisms need to be transparent. For instance, sectoral policies are often defined by the national authorities and require extensive consultation; research policies need to give priority to issues considered important by maritime stakeholders. Improving each policy’s governance is an issue by itself, but it is also an issue for integration: at all stages of the policy design, the relevant stakeholders should be included and follow the principles of maritime governance processes (see below).

Each policy should implement the IMP governance framework (see above), with participation of other national administrations, sectoral or specific ones; researchers and research institutes; NGOs advocating interests at stake in the concerned policy…), other agencies and operational structures able to contribute to the implementation of the policy, and in general, all the stakeholders likely to be concerned by positive or negative effects or consequences of the policy or of the implementation measures.

Beyond regional and global stakeholders (see above), neighbour countries should be associated to policy design when relevant (e.g. transboundary issues).

### 6.4.3. Prospective Approaches

Particular attention should be paid to prospective approaches.

The role of prospective works is to explore the field of what could be done; this can be included in a realistic way only if external factors are taken into account, such as the need to share marine resources and space, and to limit the cumulative effects on the marine and coastal environment.

It is legitimate for each sector to conduct specific prospective works, but the results, scenarios and recommendations should be tested and assessed in an integrated way, “consolidating” all maritime prospective works to assess the overall feasibility.

### 6.4.4. Vision, principles and guidelines

Each policy can legitimately (and should) develop a specific vision, related to its specific assets and objectives, but it should not be elaborated without taking into account the **general overarching vision** and **common guidelines** of the IMP (see above). Some **common principles** should be taken into account in all policies, because they are based on the status of the marine resources and of the maritime space, which of course are common goods, for instance: how are the rights to access and to use marine resources and space, which sanctions apply in case of breach of the rules. **Regulation principles** should be shared by all
maritime policies including arbitration rules and identification of leading authorities in case of cross-sectoral conflicts.

6.4.5. Strategic planning

When consistent visions are developed and common principles defined, the next step for each national policy is to define its specific objectives: usually economic and social objectives are the highest rank, while others objective are ranked lower (environmental objectives, international objectives).

This cannot be done in a completely independent way in each policy. Even if the objectives are consistent with the IMP approach, the way they are to be reached is not neutral: timescales, milestones and priorities for example can be dependent on other policies (e.g. which geographical areas or sectoral areas are to be developed with higher priority…). Strategic planning is a good way to define the way both general and specific (e.g. regional) objectives are to be reached; it is particularly related to time and space.

Strategic planning is also a major issue when it comes to deal with common resources and shared space (see below: “Maritime Spatial Planning”), or with cumulative effects of several policies (consistent strategic planning for such policies allows for instance common Strategic Environmental Assessment, SEA)

6.4.6. Implementation measures and tools

6.4.6.1. Legal policy framework

Legal instruments are the main way of defining rules which apply to all actors and stakeholders, be they public or private. Thus particular attention should be paid to the legal framework, which should be effective, efficient and consistent. This result can be achieved in a number of ways (e.g. a national ocean law, sectoral laws, sectoral regulations, cross-cutting regulations, non-legislative instruments, etc.) and invariably a combination of approaches is required.

In all cases, however, building a consistent national legal framework is a major issue when building a national IMP. It is important that the legal aspect is addressed at an early stage, and that there is proper coordination between policy-makers/administrators and lawyers and between lawyers with the various applicable policy responsibilities.

As far sectoral policies are concerned, some general principles can help design sectoral legal regulations consistent with IMP:

- first, the specific and the generic (i.e. potentially common with other policies) components of the policy should be identified; the generic component should be addressed through general or cross-sectoral measures (e.g. environmental assessment…)
- the implementation measures should be assessed to determine which are the best instruments: legal prescriptions, operational instruments (e.g. agencies, standards, certification…), financial instruments…
- only the main permanent and general arrangements of the policy should be put into legislation (definitions, long term objectives, governance and regulation principles, sanctions, evaluation and revision mechanisms…).

6.4.6.2. Other instruments and tools

Most of the main instruments (knowledge, monitoring and surveillance, maritime spatial planning…) are presented and discussed below.

It is important that each policy be designed with the objective of making maximum use of these common tools, rather than developing independent instruments. This is particularly important when such tools allow consistent application of common principles and laws (e.g. regulation, allocation of shared space, management of common resources and assessment of cumulated impacts…) and when they allow lowering total costs for the public budget.
6.4.7. Evaluation

The evaluation of the IMP relies on specific evaluation of each policy component of the IMP. It means that all maritime policies should share the same evaluation framework: common set of indicators, common milestones. This is discussed further in section 8.1.
7. International cooperation

7.1. Why is international cooperation necessary?

A successful IMP cannot exist only at the national level. Marine resources and ecosystems, commercial maritime activities and maritime threats all transcend national boundaries. Many of the most urgent challenges that require an integrated approach cannot be addressed without effective international cooperation. Many maritime activities take place on an international scale (trade, transport, cruises, etc.) and many maritime problems can only be solved through effective international cooperation (e.g. marine pollution, overfishing, climate change).

These issues sometimes require cooperation at the global level, sometimes at the regional level and sometimes at the subregional or bilateral level. Frequently, however, cooperation at a combination of levels is required. For example, overfishing is a problem addressed at the global level (e.g. by the UN General Assembly and UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, and through a number of globally-applicable fisheries agreements and instruments) but which is managed primarily at the regional level (through regional fisheries organisations such as GFCM) and requires subregional or bilateral solutions to manage shared fisheries resources. One of the objectives of international cooperation in IMP is to ensure that issues are addressed appropriately and consistently at the right levels.

For integrated governance of maritime affairs to work fully, it is crucial to develop a degree of coordination across borders, allowing exchanges of best practice and closer cooperation between states in critical areas, such as those relating to protection of the marine environment, to the safety, security and surveillance of Mediterranean maritime areas and to marine and maritime research.

Broadly speaking, international cooperation in IMP has both an external and internal dimension. The external dimension concerns representation at the international level (how to achieve objectives at the international level, negotiating international agreements, participating in international organisations, etc.). The internal dimension concerns the processes to ratify international agreements, to transpose them into national legislation and to implement their obligations, including the effective cooperation with the operational bodies of international organisations.

7.2. The external dimension

The external dimension, in turn, comprises two aspects – international cooperation on new issues (not yet covered by an international agreement or organisation) and cooperation in existing processes (i.e. representation in international organisations, processes, programmes, etc.).

7.2.1. Cooperation on new issues

Countries must seek to cooperate at the international level in response to issues that require, or can be more effectively managed by, international solutions. Such cooperation may be achieved at many different levels (global, ultra-regional, regional, subregional, bilateral) and may take many different forms (agreements – binding conventions, MOUs, codes, action plans, etc. and organisations – legally constituted, informal processes, technical networks, etc.).

There is no standard model for cooperation. In each case, a joint assessment has to be made amongst participants in cooperation as to the scale and form of cooperation.

Given the Mediterranean focus of this Manual, the following will address regional, subregional, bilateral and operational cooperation.

Regional cooperation

---

Box 3: Selected examples of international maritime issues

Global challenges
- Climate change
- Biodiversity loss
- Shipping
- Maritime security
- Social conditions in maritime sector
- Science and technology

Regional challenges
- Cruises
- Fisheries
- Land-based pollution
- Marine research

Subregional challenges
- Shared resources management
- At-sea pollution incident responses
- Monitoring and surveillance
- Maritime delimitation
There are a large number of regional organisations (at the political, regulatory, technical, scientific and advisory levels) already in the Mediterranean. However, there is no body that has a scope extending to all maritime issues and in fact several maritime issues have not yet been addressed at the regional level (e.g. submarine cables and pipelines, climate change, underwater heritage, cruises and yachting, marine renewable energy, desalination…).

Consideration could be given to developing a regional ocean policy or strategy for the Mediterranean, encompassing all Mediterranean coastal States and maritime stakeholders. A model for this exists in the Pacific Islands (see Appendix B).

Subregional and bilateral cooperation

Some issues are particularly suitable for cooperation at the subregional or bilateral level: for example, contingency and response actions to oil spills, management of shared resources (such as fisheries) and management of cross-border impacts (such as litter, waste and other deposits into the sea, etc.).

Cooperation on IMP tools at regional or subregional level

The implementation of some IMP tools and integrated operations can be better achieved if (some parts, at least) are extended to subregional or even the regional level. This concerns, in particular, integrated monitoring and surveillance of maritime activities, the improvement of marine knowledge, maritime spatial planning and integrated coastal management with countries sharing the same sea basins, resources or sharing common issues. The EU IMP may itself be seen as an implementation of such cooperation – for example, the European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODNET) seeks to build a common platform amongst Member States for the acquisition and dissemination of marine knowledge.

7.2.2. Cooperation in existing processes

A large number of international agreements (whatever form *1*) are supported by one or more permanent or temporary organisations. This includes global organisations such as IMO, regional organisations such as GFCM or UNEP/MAP and subregional processes such as the Pelagos Marine Mammal Sanctuary. It also includes organisations with political, regulatory, technical, scientific or advisory directions and often a single organisation will have bodies established for two or more of these purposes (e.g. a commission, with subsidiary bodies dealing with various scientific or technical aspects).

Cooperation in existing processes is essentially a question of *representation*, i.e. *is there sufficient national representation at the right level in all the conferences and meetings of regional agreements/organisations?*

It is essential for the countries to be represented in these organisations:

- **at the right level**: it is important that a country can participate (as appropriate) at all levels of an organisation – for example, much work, including the formulation of recommendations, in organisations (or the preparation of international agreements, protocols, etc.) is done in technical or scientific working groups and the capacity to influence the dialogue can be limited if there has been no participation in these bodies;
- **with the right people**: diplomats, lawyers, sectoral policy-makers, specialists and technical experts, etc.; depending on what is being discussed, and at what level, representatives need to be of an appropriate level of seniority and have appropriate sectoral and/or technical knowledge – in some cases (for example, where an issue is particularly important for a country), a dedicated specialised representation is necessary
- **with the right instructions**: it is essential to ensure proper coordination at the national level, with all concerned ministries and other maritime stakeholders, to ensure that positions advocated and agreed at the international level are consistent with national strategies, policies, priorities and expectations.

*1* “Agreements” here may include international conventions, memoranda of understanding, plans of action, programmes and networks.
Ensuring proper coordination (at the national level) when preparing for representation in international organisations should also mitigate another risk, i.e. that – due to the ever increasing number of agreements, organisations and processes dealing with maritime issues at the international level – there is a risk that the positions adopted by a country in some organisations are not consistent with (and therefore undermine) positions adopted in other organisations. An effective IMP should provide specific mechanisms to ensure consistency of national positions.

7.3. The internal dimension

The internal dimension is essentially a question of implementation but comprises several aspects:

- process of ratification of international agreements
- process of transposition of international agreements into national legislation
- effective implementation of the obligations of international agreements and decisions of international agreements
  - processes for these three aspects are closely related – for example, prior to ratification a country would be expected (1) to identify (and possibly implement) any necessary amendments to the legislative framework and (2) to have in place a policy for implementation and (3) to identify (and possibly implement) any necessary amendments to the administrative and technical frameworks;
- effective coordination with the operational bodies of international organisations
  - for example, ensuring that nominated focal points have sufficient technical expertise to address demands emanating from the operational body, and that the focal point has appropriate access to other decision-makers, policy and technical experts, etc. in all relevant ministries and agencies.

7.4. Improving international cooperation in Integrated Maritime Policy

In an IMP, international cooperation needs to be addressed in the first place through national policy. In this sense, the same elements apply. In other words, the vision for maritime policy must address international cooperation (what are the objectives of international cooperation, for example, what new issues has a country identified for international cooperation, what existing agreements does a country wish to ratify, etc.). Equally, governance processes must ensure that both the external and internal dimensions of international cooperation are carried out effectively and consistently and that maritime stakeholders are involved. The design, adoption and implementation of maritime policies (including the legislative and administrative frameworks to support them) must ensure that all implementation measures arising out of international agreements been introduced and transposed. Finally, where appropriate, operational and integration tools should be extended to the subregional or regional level.
8. Developing integration mechanisms and tools

Well-designed and consistent maritime policies based on common vision and governance principles are the basic components of an integrated maritime policy. But this common framework is not sufficient to ensure full integration for the long-term of these components, and it must be supported by specific mechanisms and tools, which can be developed only at national level, but often are more efficient if they are developed in the framework of multilateral or regional cooperation.

This chapter is intended to give an overview of the most important mechanisms, tools and approaches: evaluation, knowledge, marine monitoring and maritime surveillance, maritime spatial planning, integrated coastal zone management, funding. For some of these, a Mediterranean framework already exists (e.g. the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention) and/or steps are being taken in Mediterranean countries towards developing and implementing these mechanisms and tools (often in the framework of Euro-Mediterranean cooperation).

This list is by no mean an exhaustive list of all the available or applicable tools.

8.1. Evaluation

8.1.1. What is evaluation?

Evaluation is the comparison of actual outcomes against initial objectives. Its main objective is appraisal of the level of progress towards assigned policy objectives.

Every policy should be periodically evaluated in order to assess its efficiency and to allow revision when needed. Evaluation is central in the policy cycle (“define, implement, evaluate, revise”), and should be part of the core of each policy, with the objectives and governance mechanisms. Evaluation should be made at all stages of the policy: before adoption (“ex ante” evaluation), during the implementation phase (“in itinere” evaluation) and each policy revision stage (“ex post” evaluation).

Policy evaluation is aimed at policy results, not to actions and measures. “Did we do what we intended to do?” is related to monitoring; “did we reach the expected results?” is related to evaluation. Both monitoring and evaluation are closely linked, but they should not be confused (some policy actions can bring no progress; some progress can be directly related to no policy action).

The evaluation of policies is by nature political. In accordance with the policy governance framework, all the relevant stakeholders should be associated to the evaluation of the policy.

8.1.2. Indicators and observatories

Evaluation is usually based on such tools as indicators, often produced by observatories. There are other ways of evaluating policies (e.g. experts), but well-chosen/well designed indicators theoretically allow more objective evaluation.

An evaluation indicator is a piece of information related to an expected result. Policy indicators are related to policy objectives; choosing the indicators for a policy is a political decision, at the same level as choosing the policy objectives. Ideally, policy indicators should be practical (easy to produce, easy to understand by the public, “client” for the policy and voter), their number should be limited and they should be more or less related to actions fields. Indicators are frequently presented in “dashboards” in order to give an overview of the indicators.

Policy indicators are usually not directly measurable\(^\text{12}\); they often must be produced from many data of different nature often provided by many producers: economic data, resources management data, pollutant concentration.

\(^{12}\) But some of them can be measurable; e.g. pollutant concentration
environmental and physical information. In order to ensure standardization and quality of the data used and production in due time of the expected information to the decision-makers, the production of indicators is often entrusted to observatories.

Even “objective” indicators are not sufficient for evaluating a policy: in order to allow adaptation of policies and actions if needed, the evaluation must produce in-depth analysis of the indicators and of the differences between the actual objectives reached and the expected objectives. This is usually done by the observatories.

An very schematic example of evaluation cycle is given in the following figure:

- from the policy objectives, a set of indicators is defined;
- from information and data gathered in all concerned maritime sectors, the policy observatory produces indicators and analyses (such as forecasts, etc.);
- which are used by decision makers to adapt if needed either the policy implementation measures, or the policy objectives.

![Evaluation Cycle Diagram](image)

**Figure 13: Evaluation cycle**

### 8.1.3. Why is evaluation essential for IMP?

The core of the IMP is a common vision of the future, and hence a common vision of the various relevant objectives pursued through this integrated policy: measuring progress towards these common objectives is a major issue for the IMP.

Each well-designed maritime policy should define specific evaluation mechanisms at all stages of implementation; the specific evaluation mechanisms cannot be independent for each maritime policy: they should be consistent in order to allow evaluation of the overarching IMP.

### 8.1.4. Evaluation of the IMP: common mechanisms and tools

Establishing common evaluation mechanisms for all the maritime policies is important. Such mechanisms should comprise, among others:

- a **consistent set of indicators**, in order to allow producing by each maritime policy of the information needed to evaluate the IMP; these indicators should be consistent with the indicators needed for evaluation of policies at higher level (regional, global)
8.2. Knowledge

Shared decisions rely on shared information. Moreover, given the complexity of the marine environment and hence of the IMP, there are strong interrelations between many marine and maritime parameters at all scales. Finally, gathering information or producing knowledge related to marine and maritime space, activities and environment is a difficult work, requiring various often expensive means (laboratories, monitoring networks, ships, planes, satellites...): integrating marine and maritime knowledge is a major issue for the IMP.

The field of marine and maritime knowledge extends far beyond research: even if many things are still to be discovered as far as the Ocean is concerned, so policies must essentially rely on existing knowledge.

Integrating marine and maritime knowledge can be achieved through several complementary and parallel ways:

- common research programs
  - The EU has produced a Communication about this issue, and about marine and maritime research.
- common legislation or standards
  - The EU legislation created strong integration frameworks through various legal instruments such as the INSPIRE directive, and (mainly environmental) regulations such as framework directives (water, marine strategy)
- networks and common databases
  - The EU is developing common marine knowledge tools; e.g. “Building a European marine knowledge infrastructure: Roadmap for a European Marine Observation and Data Network”, SEC(2009) 499;
  - Atlas
    - The EU is developing a European Atlas of the Seas.
• web portals allowing centralised access to distributed databases maintained by various organisations.

Many national actions related to marine and maritime knowledge are related to actions and programs conducted at higher level (regional, global), and should be considered beyond the national framework (see above).

8.3. Monitoring and surveillance

In this section, “Monitoring” is related to environment (in a broad sense: ecosystems, but also “socio-ecosystems”; monitoring concerns economic, social, environmental parameters. “Surveillance” is related to human (mainly, but not only maritime) activities.

Nevertheless, there are close relations between monitoring and surveillance:

• in both cases, the objective is to gather and produce information in order to support decision and action;
• a part of the changes detected through monitoring can be related to human activities, and identification of this part is a major concern for the IMP.

Monitoring and surveillance of course produce knowledge; knowledge obviously contributes to policy decision. What is specific to monitoring and surveillance is that they are mainly driven by policy:

• the main objective of monitoring is to detect and assess changes related to policy actions measures and activities, such as management measures;
• the main objective of surveillance is to ensure that policy measures are applied.

Monitoring and surveillance and should as far as possible be considered with a wide scope, beyond the national level; this is generally possible for monitoring, but integrating maritime surveillance beyond this level is still a difficult issue, as many surveillance issues are closely related to national sovereignty.

8.3.1. Maritime surveillance

With the constant growth of maritime activities, the growing concerns related to safety and security and the potential increase of their impacts on marine resources and environment, the surveillance of maritime activities is becoming a major issue.

In the framework of a national IMP, maritime surveillance aims to gather information about the activities in the maritime areas under sovereignty or jurisdiction of the country. Surveillance information contributes to many policy objectives:

• defense and security (immigration, surveillance of maritime approaches, maritime piracy, trafficking and smuggling…)
• protection of marine environment (pollution, biodiversity, etc.)
• management and protection of marine resources (fisheries, oil and gas, biological resources…)
• protection of human life and goods (safety…).

Even if the objectives of many policies are quite different, they are based on the same surveillance systems: land, air and seaborne radar stations, cameras, AIS, etc. and can technically draw benefit from joint implementation of systems and sharing information.

Nevertheless, most of surveillance systems and networks are still sectoral and closely related to sectoral policies, and operated by distinct often sectoral administrations or agencies funded separately. Increasing
the efficiency of the systems, reducing costs, filling information gaps and avoiding duplication are some of the potential benefits of such integration. The final expected result is a common maritime awareness picture.

Figure 14: Example of information layers (source: EC, COM (2010) 584)

The EU produced communications about integration of maritime surveillance and establishment of a common information sharing environment not based on sharing everything with everybody, but “sharing on a need-to-know and responsibility-to-share basis”. The flexible approach proposed by the EU roadmap can be adapted to each country needs.

8.3.2. Environmental monitoring

Many policies require marine environmental monitoring, e.g. industry monitoring their effects on the local environment.

This often leads to the development of specific requirements, with specific standards and based on independent monitoring networks operated by independent agencies or organisations.

Yet there are many potential benefits in better integration of all monitoring networks and procedures, whatever the policy they are related and the organisation (public or private) in charge of monitoring:

- better coherence (same standards for data and procedures)
- reduction of costs (common developments, data management, in situ systems…)
- reduction of duplicate efforts
- better time-space coverage for the same cost.

Full integration of all monitoring systems is one of the possible solutions; another more accessible solution (maybe more efficient on long-term, and more in line with the general principle of IMP “build on exiting”) is networking of monitoring networks, with common governance processes, common planning and interoperable databases.

8.4. Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP)

More and more human activities use and occupy the maritime space.

The traditional sectoral regulation approaches (rules of the road, management of maritime public domain...) are no longer sufficient to take into account the need for:

- optimisation of the use of often scarce and disputed space (e.g. coastal zones),
- regulation of cross-sectoral competition (e.g. competition between fisheries and wind farms),
- reduction of the cumulative impacts of "densifying" activities, or
- adaptation to the changing environment (e.g. changes in ecosystems due to global climate change).

A unified integrated framework for managing space-related maritime activities and issues is the best way to regulate in the long-term the use of maritime space e.g. Marine Spatial Planning (MSP).

Basically, this type of approach is not new: all or nearly all countries have developed a spatial planning framework for the management of land and terrestrial activities. However, such a framework cannot be easily extended to the maritime space, which is a public shared space open to all, with three dimensions, and where many activities do not use space permanently.

MSP is strongly supported in the EU, where there is a need for strategic planning in the framework of many regulations and policies (strategic environmental assessment, NATURA 2000, water and marine frameworks directives, fisheries common policy, ICZM).

The needs and general approach have been developed in several EU documents:

- "Roadmap for Maritime Spatial Planning : Achieving Common Principles in the EU" 20
- Maritime Spatial Planning in the EU: Achievements and Future Developments" 21

Such a tool should of course be developed following the fundamental principles of the IMP and based on the integration of mechanisms such as governance, consistence with the IMP vision, transboundary cooperation, land-sea integration, monitoring, surveillance, evaluation and knowledge. In order to ensure future consistency at a regional scale, national MSP mechanisms should be consistent with principles developed through cooperation processes beyond the national level.

All the major IMPs in the world include a MSP framework22.

8.5. Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM)

Land-sea integration is a major concern for IMP: most maritime activities or marine resources complement or extend land activities and resources, all maritime activities start or end on the coast (ports, cables...), and most of marine pollution has land-based origin. The coastal zone is an essential link between land and sea.

The need for integrated approaches of activities and policies in the coastal zones (i.e. land and sea strips on either side of the coastline) has been highlighted several tens of years ago, leading to the concept of "Integrated Coastal Zones Management", now widespread all around the world and supported by legal national or international instruments such as the ICZM Protocol to the Barcelona Convention which entered into force in 2011.

ICZM seems to be focused on management when IMP focuses on policies; on the other hand, the IMP completely covers all maritime issues and zones, when the ICZM scope is both more

---

22 See for instance USA ([http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/...](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/...)) or Australia (Task-Force.pdf) or Australia [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/...](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/...)}
limited (only the coastal part of the maritime zones) and wider (ICZM explicitly covers the management of the land part of coastal zones). But ICZM and IMP both basically support the same integrated approach, and they can and should be developed in a consistent and complementary way:

- IMP can give ICZM the long-term and long-range vision needed to deal with maritime issues;
- ICZM can support IMP, providing relevant management mechanisms and tools for addressing coastal issues and linking a seamless way land policies and maritime policies and tools (e.g. MSP).

ICZM is both a self-sufficient policy, and an important potential contribution to the IMP.

8.6. Funding

Many policy actions and measures are funded through specific mechanisms: sectoral policies, specific fees, support from sub-national powers or from national or international programs related to various cooperation frameworks (research, international cooperation, neighbourhood policy…). Each funding mechanism is associated to specific governance, reporting needs, calendars, etc.

Even when these actions and measures are designed and decided in an integrated framework, distinct funding mechanisms tend to autonomize them and to “dis-integrate” at the operational level those programs, measures and actions which were integrated at the design level.

Specific mechanisms should be implemented to ensure that public funding sources and opportunities are used in a consistent long-term way in the framework of the IMP governance, avoiding duplication and gaps, improving visibility for the maritime sector, and often allowing mutualization of expensive means and agencies.

In some cases, some mechanisms should be developed to allow cooperation between public and private sectors; mapping efforts for example could benefit from joint funding from and better cooperation between private sectors (interested by resources exploitation) and public agencies in charge of resources assessment and management.

Whenever possible funding mechanisms should be considered beyond the national level, as a contribution to the future regional IMP.

8.7. Other operational mechanisms

Other operational mechanisms can be developed or adapted in order to allow better integration of policies at the operational level.

For instance, agencies can strongly support consistent implementation of sectoral policies. Rather than creating separate specific agencies dedicated to specific policies, joint agencies can be in charge of some operational parts of several policies.

Examples of such agencies:

- **research agencies**: giving the same agency responsibilities on the field of marine resources, for example, or of monitoring;
  - Many countries have created such agencies; within the EU, IFREMER (France) is placed under the authority of four ministers
- **regulation agencies**: under joint control by the concerned administrations, such agencies can be in charge of the management of maritime space, of the management of the coastal zones, or be the “single window” for all authorizations and permits related to the exploitation of marine resources of the use of the maritime space;
  - In the UK, the Marine Management Organisation is an executive non-departmental public body in charge of maritime planning and licensing
• **surveillance agencies**, in charge of operating the various systems and networks dedicated to maritime surveillance (radar stations, etc.)

• “**enforcement**” agencies, in charge of the police operations at sea.
  
  o In Algeria, the Service National des Gardes-Côtes operates the surveillance systems and implements the enforcement measures at sea on behalf of all the concerned ministries.

Some difficult issues or expensive capacities can be more efficiently addressed through **joint mechanisms** developed at regional or subregional levels: joint agencies can be an efficient response. Some of them can be developed in the framework of legal instruments at regional scale (e.g. REMPEC) or of Euro-Mediterranean or multilateral cooperation agreements (e.g. SAFEMED, 2005 Agreement between Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia for the development of subregional pollution contingency plan).

**Standards** are another very efficient way to develop integration through convergence of industry practices towards best practices. Even if many standards are developed as technical solutions to technical problems, they are strong “soft” tools, often providing efficient “bottom-up” mechanisms to transfer best practices into integrated regulatory instruments. All countries should consider their participation in actions aimed at developing international standards (general, e.g. methodology, or specifically maritime) as a contribution to better integration.
Appendices
Appendix A. The EU IMP

The EU launched the Integrated Maritime Policy for the European Union in 2007. It is a policy that covers both internal (i.e. Member State level) and external (i.e. international) matters, addresses matters within EU competence and the interface with matters falling within Member State competence and is designed as an integrated, horizontal and cross-sector policy. It covers a range of maritime sectors (transport, fisheries, mariculture, energy, etc.), incorporates cross-cutting issues (protection of the marine environment, marine research, etc.) and has a strong strategic focus linked to economic objectives (competitiveness of marine businesses, employment in the marine sectors, etc.).

The IMP is broadly based on two main aspects: applying an integrated approach to maritime governance and implementation of IMP tools.

Governance
The Policy recognizes that integration needs to be developed at the EU level (coordination between Commission DGs, involvement of EU agencies with maritime-related functions, etc.), between the EU and Member States (not only coordination but also developing common guidelines and approaches) and at the stakeholder level. Better regulation principles are intended to guide policy-making on maritime issues from an early stage: identification of major maritime-related initiatives in the annual planning and programming instruments, consultation of civil society and interested parties, impact assessments and inter-service working groups are to ensure that the European Commission is able to design and deliver genuinely integrated proposals.

IMP tools
The original EU IMP foresaw three main horizontal planning tools:

- **Integrated maritime surveillance**, aimed at a higher degree of coordination and cooperation within and among the Member States' coastguards and other appropriate agencies and the gradual achievement of an integrated network of state-based surveillance systems creating a “European network” of maritime surveillance.

- **Maritime spatial planning** to assist coordinated action between public authorities and stakeholders to optimize the use of marine space for economic development and for the benefit of the marine environment. (In November 2008, the Commission released a Communication on the Road Map for MSP; the Communication outlines the initial steps towards development of a common approach on MSP and seeks to encourage debate to help guide the development of MSP within the EU.)

- **Observation and data network**, recognizing that a comprehensive and accessible source of and infrastructure for data and information is essential both to policy development and implementation the Policy sets out the need for an EU-wide network for collecting and compiling data in a comprehensive and compatible system, and made accessible as a tool for better governance, expansion of value-added services and sustainable maritime development.

Implementation / Action Plan
To accompany the policy an action plan was released which outlined a series of 65 actions to be taken by the EU to implement and develop IMP. It included new working methods, cross-cutting tools and a wide range of specific actions that aimed to benefit the maritime economy, protect marine environment, strengthen research and innovation, foster development in coastal and outermost regions, address international maritime affairs, and raise the visibility of Europe's maritime dimension. As of December 2010, 56 of the 65 actions had been completed or launched (in addition to a number of additional activities originally not foreseen in the Action Plan).

Among the key achievements are:

- the introduction of **Marine Knowledge 2020**, a proposal to enhance understanding of Europe's seas and oceans, to make using marine data easier and less costly and to encourage competitiveness among marine data users;
the creation of the European Marine Observation and Data Network (EMODNET);

- a proposal to encourage the creation of and input from maritime clusters (broadly defined as a group of firms, related economic actors and institutions that are located near each other and have reached a sufficient scale to develop specialized expertise, services, resources, suppliers and skills);

- the adoption of Guidelines to Member States on an Integrated Approach to Maritime Policy;

- adoption of a roadmap on MSP, which sets out key principles and seeks to discuss the development of a common approach among Member States encouraging the implementation of MSP at national and EU level.23

In addition to the cross-cutting IMP tools, the Action Plan provided for sectoral actions in all relevant policy areas related to maritime activities. Aspects of two key cross-cutting policy areas (research and environment) are of note, in that a specific integrated approach to marine activities is already in place:

- The Marine and Maritime Research Strategy is the first ever European strategy to promote marine research and is designed to promote development of cutting-edge innovations both through better integration of existing research efforts and by developing new capacities across a multidisciplinary scope of sciences.

- The Marine Strategy Framework Directive (MSFD), which constitutes the environmental pillar of the IMP, requires Member States to achieve good environmental status in their marine waters by 2020, thereby protecting the resource base upon which marine-related economic and social activities depend. The implementation of this Directive will benefit from the further development of cross-cutting tools of IMP, such as marine spatial planning and EMODNET, while in return, the various actions required for its implementation, such as the socio-economic analysis of human activities related to the sea, due in 2012 and regularly thereafter will underpin the further development of the IMP.

Other progress of note in sectoral policies includes:

- Adoption of a revised maritime transport strategy (2009-2018), in particular to include a proposal for the creation of a European Maritime Transport Space without barriers (a maritime transport space free of unnecessary administrative barriers and duplicated cross-border controls).

- Continued integration of environmental aspects into the CFP (in particular, through the development of the ecosystem approach to fisheries) and greater attention to other aspects of the fisheries sector (e.g. labour conditions, safety) which are currently prominent in international forums.

- Inclusion of MSP in the Communication on offshore wind energy proposals.

Additional focus on marine and coastal environments within the strategy on adaptation to climate change.

23 The Commission has now launched an impact assessment to explore a range of options to promote and develop MSP and ICZM. The outcome of this work will be presented in 2011.
Appendix B. State Practice on IMP

B.1. EU Member States
The EU IMP states that “Member States should develop their own integrated maritime policies” (COM(2008) 395) and in practice several Member States have adopted (comprehensive or partial) IMPs, or have established processes or governance structures to develop it. (A review of all practice is beyond the scope of this document, but some illustrations are set out below.)

Cyprus provides a recent example: in January 2011, an inter-ministerial committee was created to deal with IMP. This committee is comprised of all relevant Ministries (Communications and Works, Foreign Affairs, Interior, Justice and Public Order, Commerce, Industry and Tourism and Agriculture, Natural Resources and Environment). The committee is support by a National Coordination team, which is responsible for coordinating the activities of various Departments/Services in relation to the IMP at the national and EU level and is comprised of experts from various Government departments and is directed by the Department of Merchant Shipping.

The United Kingdom introduced a new Marine Policy in 2011, which seeks to implement integrated approaches foreseen in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009. While there is no executive-level body with overall responsibility for IMP, the Act created the Act established the Marine Management Organisation which is an executive non-departmental public body designed to provide coherent management in a number of sectors, including: marine emergencies, strategic culture, marine planning (including the establishment of marine conservation zones), marine licensing, fisheries management, enforcement and marine nature conservation.

Within the Member States there is also a developing body of practice on the implementation of IMP tools, measures and approaches – particularly (at the national level) with respect to MSP. In 2005, The Netherlands introduced a comprehensive Integrated Management Plan for the North Sea with the objectives “to enhance the economic importance of the North Sea and maintain and develop the international ecological and landscape features”. The use of MSP techniques are central to the plan, and the policy provides a guiding marine spatial management framework in which location-based uses (usage zones), a zoning scheme for growth options, and several exclusion policies, are defined. This is supplement by a system of permits for the regulation of offshore activities. The policies are implemented through the Coordinating Minister for North Sea Affairs (= the Minister of Infrastructure and the Environment) and the Inter-ministerial Board for North Sea Affairs, comprised of representatives from around 8 ministries.

In Germany, the Government in 2007 developed multiple-use marine spatial plans for the German EEZ. Marine spatial plans for the territorial sea (up to 12 nautical miles) are the responsibility of the German Länder (regional states), and in the EEZ the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Development. Three types of zones are used for the implementation of spatial plans. These include “priority areas” where one use (for example, shipping, pipelines, etc.) is granted priority over all other spatially significant uses; “reservation areas” where one use is given special consideration in a comparative evaluation with other spatially significant planning tasks, measures and projects; and “marine protected areas” where measures are applicable for the reduction of impacts (e.g., through pollution) on the marine environment.

B.2. Other countries
Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy
The Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy (PIROP) came from an initiative recommended by the Pacific Islands Forum Leaders in 1999 and was adopted in 2002. Its development was a collaborative effort involving several regional organisations in the Pacific region (primarily: Forum Fisheries Agency, Secretariat of the Pacific Community, Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme, South Pacific Geoscience Commission and the University of the South Pacific), as well as a wide stakeholder consultation. It is the only policy of its kind in the world. While strategies, actions plans etc. have been developed (often on a sectoral basis) in several regions, the PIROP is the only comprehensive ocean policy to be adopted at the regional level.
The policy is not legally binding and needs to be implemented through national laws and action plans. However it does provide guidance to countries in the region when developing their national agendas and a platform for action plans within the region. The policy has been endorsed by all Pacific Island countries and territories. It is applicable to the region as a whole, including waters under areas of national jurisdiction and beyond.

The policy expresses both a vision – “A healthy ocean that sustains the livelihoods and aspirations of Pacific Island communities” – and a goal – “to ensure the future sustainable use of [the] ocean and its resources by Pacific Islands communities and external partners” and is based on five main principles:

- **“Improving our understanding of the ocean”**. This principle recognizes the limited success of resource-based management which is based purely on (often inadequate) scientific information. New approaches need to be developed to deal with scientific uncertainty, including through community consultations.

- **“Sustainably developing and managing the use of Ocean resources”**. The Pacific Islands are heavily reliant on marine services and resources. It is therefore imperative that the ocean is developed in a sustainable manner. This is applicable to the use of living and non-living resources.

- **“Maintaining the health of the Ocean”**. Recognizing that the ocean must be maintained on a regional ecosystem basis, countries need to have strategies and policies which minimize the impact of human activity. In particular it is recognized that eighty per cent of ocean pollution originates from land based sources. Strategies should be adopted that seek to minimize any pollution originating from marine, terrestrial or atmospheric sources.

- **“Promoting the peaceful use of the Ocean”**. Peaceful use of the oceans encompasses environmental, political, social, economic and security dimensions. Peaceful uses of the oceans also means discouraging and reducing unacceptable, illicit, criminal, or other activities contrary to regional and international agreements. Pacific Island countries are required to be able to exercise control and compliance within their waters. However given a lack of capacity in the region this cannot be done in isolation. International collaboration will be fundamental in achieving this principle.

- **“Creating Partnerships and promoting cooperation”**. Cooperation and effective partnerships are critical for sustainable use of the ocean. Additional benefits are gained from such cooperation these include: achieving economies of scale, a united voice for international advocacy, a regional power bloc with increased international influence and a forum for developing coordinated action on ocean issues of mutual interest or with transboundary implications.

The policy is elaborated through the **Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Framework for Integrated Strategic Action (PIROFISA)**, which is a framework and series of actions for implementation of the policy (both new initiatives and ongoing processes), based around the five main principles. The PIROFISA is also supported by a governance strategy which envisions: the establishment of a Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy office, tasked with coordinating implementation of the PIROFISA; the nomination of focal points in regional organisations; and the establishment of a network of relevant NGOs, non-state actors and private sector interests to ensure stakeholder engagement.
It is also noteworthy that an existing governance structure – the Council of Regional Organisations in the Pacific (CROP, which comprises all the major regional organisations in the Pacific and coordinates maritime issues through a Marine Sector Working Group) – is to play a role on coordinating the regional policy and in overseeing its monitoring, evaluation and review.

**Australia**

Australia introduced its *Oceans Policy* in 1998 after it was recognized that a sectoral management approach was not sustainable in the long-term. The policy is centred around an integrated governance structure and an integrated and ecosystems-based oceans planning and management system. Designed to establish a framework to “promote ecologically-sustainable development” of ocean resources and “the encouragement of internationally competitive marine industries, while ensuring the protection of marine biological diversity”, the Policy recognizes that the management of resources in the oceans requires an integrated approach that balances environmental, economic and social objectives.

The Policy (which does not have legislative status) is implemented through a range of mechanisms, the main ones being:

- **An Integrated Oceans Process**, designed to address complex marine issues at a regional or national level by providing: best practice for integrated marine management; clarity of processes for marine managers and stakeholders; and security for industry to plan for future development in a multiple-use context.

- **Oceans Guidelines**, together with sectoral guidelines, which provide assistance to marine managers and users to achieve more sustainable and efficient outcomes. The Guidelines provide: ways to apply Oceans Policy to managing oceans activities; and advice to oceans users on how to better understand and comply with government requirements.

- **Regional Marine Planning**, which sets out clear regional objectives to assist in achieving ecologically sustainable development in a particular region by assessing the social, economic and environmental status of the region and setting targeted strategies to address priority regional issues.

- **Cross-sectoral Institutional Arrangements** to provide high-level policy and management directions, coordination of marine management issues and coordination of marine research priorities, which consist principally of:
  - The **lead institution**, initially being a specially created National Oceans Office, but now a division of the Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities. The Department coordinates with other Departments and agencies as required.
The Oceans Board of Management, a whole-of-government forum to oversee operational aspects of the Government's marine planning programme and Australia's Oceans Policy. It comprises representatives from seven departments and agencies relevant to Australia's marine jurisdiction.24

The National Oceans Advisory Group, which is the peak stakeholder body comprised mainly of sectoral representatives from industry, science and conservation, selected for expertise in marine issues.

Within the Policy, and in particular the regional marine planning process, a number of integrated tools are employed including:

- development of clear regional objectives for uses, resources and ecosystems;
- zoning for single or multiple uses, including seasons;
- resource-specific allocations for access and use through the existing responsible sectoral management arrangements;
- complementary planning and management requirements implemented by individual sectors;
- outcome-based measures, with industry or user-determined mechanisms for implementation; and
- sustainability indicators, monitoring, reporting and adaptive development of management controls.

Canada

Integrated maritime policy in Canada has its foundation in the Oceans Act, which calls on the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans to lead and facilitate the development of a national oceans strategy to guide the management of Canada's estuarine, coastal and marine ecosystems. Pursuant to this, “Canada’s Oceans Strategy” was adopted in 2002 providing for an integrated approach to ocean management, coordination of policies and programs across governments and an ecosystem approach to policies, planning and implementation.

It is based on the principles of sustainable development, Integrated Management and the precautionary approach. In addition The Policy and Operational Framework for Integrated Management of Estuarine, Coastal and Marine Environments in Canada is intended as a working document for Canada’s oceans community. It is intended to foster discussion about integrated management approaches by setting out policy in the legislative context, along with concepts and principles.

The policy is implemented through two broad concepts:

- **Integrated Management Bodies**: The governance of this policy is established through collaboration of participants from all sectors and at all levels, including: Federal Authorities, Provincial/ Territorial/ Regional Authorities, Aboriginals, Industry and resource groups, NGOs, community groups and the academic, scientific and research community. This then leads to the establishment of an Integrated Management Body that serves initially to foster information exchange and then to advise decision-makers. The principle is that of collaborative management, where those with the authority to make a decision, and those who are interested or affected by that decision, will jointly seek an outcome that meets the interests of all concerned.

The specific composition and role of Integrated Management Bodies will vary, depending on the scale of the initiative, the complexity of the issues, local and regional infrastructures and local capacity, local circumstances, the actual management area, issues and the level of concern.

- **Integrated Planning Process**: This is a common approach to decision-making, which utilizes a six step planning process:

---

24 Departments of: Environment and Heritage; Industry, Tourism and Resources; Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; Education, Science and Training; Transport and Regional Services; Defence; Finance and Administration; Prime Minister and Cabinet; and the Australian Fisheries Management Authority.
- defining and assessing a management area;
- engaging affected interests;
- developing an Integrated Management plan;
- endorsement of plan by decision-making authorities;
- implementing the plan; and
- monitoring and evaluating outcomes.

**Japan**

Japan adopted *Guidelines for Ocean Policy* and a *Basic Act on Ocean Policy* in 2007. The two instruments established a basic framework and mechanism according to which ocean policy could be implemented in a more integrated manner. The Act established a *Maritime Policy Headquarters* to act as the high-level coordinating body for maritime policy. The body is under the responsibility of the Prime Minister, and the Chief Cabinet Secretary and a newly assigned Minister for Ocean Policy serve as Headquarters Deputy Chiefs. Marine related parties, in conjunction with the organisation, are expected to collaborate and cooperate with each other to strategically promote ocean policy.

Management of the marine area is based on a coastal zone management system. Each zone recognized the coastal sea areas and land areas. Based on this recognition the following management measures are being promoted to regional authorities and decision-makers in general:

- areas to be treated in an integrated manner, including both land areas and marine zones;
- areas that are used for diversified purposes; and
- areas where various phenomena relate to each other, and where management should be carried out from a comprehensive standpoint so as to preserve proper conditions of the entirety of the zones.

**USA**

IMP in the United States is centred around three aspects:

- a *National Ocean Policy*, providing the overall strategy, vision and direction for US maritime policy; and
- governance arrangements, in the form of the *National Ocean Council*;
- an implementation strategy based around nine *national priority objectives*, including *Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning (CMSP)*.

The National Policy includes a set of overarching guiding principles for management decisions and actions toward achieving the vision of “an America whose stewardship ensures that the ocean, our coasts, and the Great Lakes are healthy and resilient, safe and productive, and understood and treasured so as to promote the well-being, prosperity, and security of present and future generations.” It both foresees the creation both of the National Ocean Council and includes the adoption of the national priority objectives.

New governance arrangements for US maritime policy were established in July 2010, when the National Ocean Council was established. This high-level body consolidated and replaced components of the pre-existing Committee on Ocean Policy and consists of high-level representatives from all the major departments, agencies and other bodies concerned with maritime affairs.\(^{25}\)

It is supported by:

\(^{25}\) The full list comprises: (a) The Secretaries of: State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Commerce, Labor, Transportation, Energy, and Homeland Security; (b) The Attorney General; (c) The Administrators of: the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); (d) The Chairs of: The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and the Joint Chiefs of Staff; (e) The Directors of: the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), National Intelligence, the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the National Science Foundation (NSF); (f) The Assistants to: the President for National Security Affairs, Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, Domestic Policy, Economic Policy, and Energy and Climate Change; (g) An employee of the United States designated by the Vice President; and (h) The Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere (NOAA Administrator).
- a Steering Committee (a high-level forum for ensuring integration and coordination on priority areas within the NOC);

- the Ocean Resource Management Interagency Policy Committee (an ocean resource management body, with an emphasis on ensuring the interagency implementation of the National Policy, national priority objectives and other priorities defined or approved by the NOC);

- the Ocean Science and Technology Interagency Policy Committee (the ocean science and technology body of the NOC, with an emphasis on ensuring the interagency implementation of science and technology objectives); and

- since February 2011, the Governance Coordinating Committee (a coordinating body on inter-jurisdictional ocean policy issues).

The nine national priority objectives are:

1. **Ecosystem-Based Management**: as a foundational principle for comprehensive management of the ocean, coasts and the Great Lakes.

2. **Coastal and Marine Spatial Planning**: Implementation of comprehensive, integrated, ecosystem based coastal and marine spatial planning and management.

3. **Inform Decisions and Improve Understanding**: Increase knowledge to continually inform and improve management and policy decisions and the capacity to respond to change and challenges. Better educate the public through formal and informal programs about the ocean, coasts and the Great Lakes.

4. **Coordinate and Support**: Better coordinate and support Federal, State, tribal, local, and regional management of the ocean, coasts and the Great Lakes. Improve coordination and integration across the Federal Government and, as appropriate, engage with the international community.

5. **Resiliency and Adaptation to Climate Change and Ocean Acidification**: Strengthen resiliency of coastal communities and marine and Great Lakes environments and their abilities to adapt to climate change impacts and ocean acidification.

6. **Regional Ecosystem Protection and Restoration**: Establish and implement an integrated ecosystem protection and restoration strategy that is science-based and aligns conservation and restoration goals at the Federal, state, tribal, local and regional levels.

7. **Water Quality and Sustainable Practices on Land**: Enhance water quality in the ocean, along the coasts and in the Great Lakes by promoting and implementing sustainable practices on land.

8. **Changing Conditions in the Arctic**: Address environmental stewardship needs in the Arctic Ocean and adjacent coastal areas in the face of climate-induced and other environmental changes.

9. **Ocean, Coastal, and Great Lakes Observations, Mapping, and Infrastructure**: Strengthen and integrate Federal and non-Federal ocean observing systems, sensors, data collection platforms, data management, and mapping capabilities into a national system, and integrate that system into international observation efforts.

**Other countries**

Several other countries have developed IMPs, are developing IMPs or are implementing IMP approaches. There are some broad similarities between many of these policies – for example, all emphasize the need to match sustainable development with protection of the marine environment. All address sectoral and cross-cutting policies, and often spatial policies. Most of them also create specific (but varied) governance structures. In Colombia for example, the National Oceans and Coastal Regions Policy is overseen by the Colombia Ocean Commission, while a National Inter-agency Committee for the National Ocean and Coastal Regions Policy (CNI PNOEC) is established to coordinate the different local, regional and national State bodies. In Brazil, different arrangements exist for the National Maritime Policy (PMN) and the National Policy on Marine Resources (PNRM). The former includes a series of actions and indicates the various ministries and agencies which are involved and from these nominates the ministry with coordination responsibility. The
latter falls under the remit of an Inter-ministerial Commission for Marine Resources (CIRM), which has responsibility to coordinate matters relating to the attainment of the PNRM; support the programmes and activities flowing from the PNRM and its outcomes; and propose PNRM updates. In the Republic of Korea most maritime issues have been relocated to a single ministry – the Ministry of Maritime Affairs and Fisheries (MOMAF) – but with specific involvement of other ocean-related agencies in the Marine and Fisheries Development Basic Plan.

While not a comprehensive IMP, Norway launched Maritim 21 in 2007, a holistic research and innovation strategy for the maritime industry in Norway. The mandate given at the time included three key aspects. Firstly, to develop a holistic research and innovation strategy for the maritime industry in Norway. Secondly, to develop new and more efficient forms of collaboration – within the industry and between industry and government. Thirdly, to increase the innovation tempo through collaboration and new business models. The strategy has seven key focus areas (marine policies and regulations, arctic transport and operations, demanding maritime operations, liquefied natural gas, efficient and environmentally friendly use of energy, maritime innovation and business development and knowledge hub and infrastructure) and is implemented by MARUT, a body created in 2004 by the Ministry of Trade and Industry which brings together several government agencies, regulatory bodies and the maritime industry with the goal of increasing the contribution to maritime research and innovation.
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